

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MUAZZEZ MIRA, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a  
Washington Corporation, and ACTALENT,  
INC. (aka/previously EASI LLC), a  
Maryland corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01353-TL

ORDER ON JOINT MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE CASES

This matter is before the Court on Defendants Actalent, Inc.,<sup>1</sup> and Microsoft Corporation's Joint Motion to Consolidate Cases. Dkt. No. 16. Defendants seek to consolidate this matter with *Mirasedoglu v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. C24-1512 (W.D. Wash.). *Id.* at 1. Plaintiff Muazzez Mira did not respond to the motion. Having reviewed the relevant record, the Court GRANTS the motion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant Actalent states that they are incorrectly named in the Complaint and are instead named "Actalent Services, LLC." Dkt. No. 16 at 1.

1 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) provides that “[i]f actions before the court involve  
2 a common question of law or fact, the court may . . . consolidate the actions.” Courts have broad  
3 discretion to consolidate cases pending in the same district. *Garity v. APWU Nat’l Labor Org.*,  
4 828 F.3d 848, 855–56 (9th Cir. 2016). In deciding whether to exercise this discretion, courts  
5 generally look to such factors as “judicial economy, whether consolidation would expedite  
6 resolution of the case, whether separate cases may yield inconsistent results, and the potential  
7 prejudice to [any opposing party].” *Amazon.com, Inc. v. AutoSpeedstore*, No. C22-1183, 2022  
8 WL 11212033, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 19, 2022) (citing 9 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R.  
9 Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc. § 2383 (3d ed., Apr. 2022 update)).

10 The Court finds that consolidation is appropriate here. Although Plaintiff is named  
11 differently in the two actions, Defendants point out that “there is no dispute that it is the same  
12 individual” (Dkt. No. 16 at 2), and Plaintiff does not object to that assertion. Further, Plaintiff  
13 makes some of the same allegations in both actions: in sum and substance, Plaintiff alleges that  
14 she was initially denied the ability to take family leave and was ultimately retaliated against,  
15 even after the leave was approved. Compare Dkt. No. 1-2 ¶¶ 5–12, with *Mirasedoglu*, No. C24-  
16 1512, Dkt. No. 1-2 at 6 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 20, 2024). Plaintiff makes additional allegations in  
17 *Mirasedoglu* related to her employment status and various employment policies (see No. C24-  
18 1512, Dkt. No. 1-2 at 4–6), but critically, all allegations stem from her employment relationship  
19 with Defendant Actalent, her placement with Defendant Microsoft, and her interactions with  
20 various individuals—including *Mirasedoglu* defendant Jeff Wilder and Defendant Actalent’s  
21 manager Bruce Gale, both of whom are discussed in both complaints.

22 In addition, both actions raise related legal claims that involve the same witnesses. In this  
23 matter, Plaintiff brings a claim for alleged violation of the Family and Medical Leave Act  
24 (“FMLA”) as well as violation of the Washington State Family Leave Act and wrongful

1 termination in violation of public policy. Dkt. No. 1-2 ¶¶ 18–33. In *Mirasedoglu*, Plaintiff brings  
2 a FMLA claim (for leave denial and termination) as well as several other claims for violations of  
3 various labor and employment statutes, both state and federal. No. C24-1512, Dkt. No. 1-2 at 6–  
4 8. In both actions, these claims stem from Plaintiff’s interactions with largely the same set of  
5 individuals and entities. *Compare* Dkt. No. 1-2 ¶¶ 5–12, with *Mirasedoglu*, No. C24-1512, Dkt.  
6 No. 1-2 at 4–6. Thus, similar questions of law and fact will arise in both actions.

7 “Ultimately, given the substantial overlap between these matters, consolidation will  
8 promote judicial economy and expedite resolution of the cases by simplifying discovery, pretrial  
9 motions, and other case management issues, and it will reduce the risk of inconsistent results.”  
10 *Franzetti v. Pac. Mkt. Int’l LLC*, No. C24-191, 2024 WL 1832470, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 26,  
11 2024) (citing *Pecznick v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. C22-743 et al., 2022 WL 4483123, at \*3–4  
12 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 27, 2022)).

13 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

- 14 (1) Defendants’ Joint Motion to Consolidate Cases (Dkt. No. 16) is GRANTED.
- 15 (2) This matter and *Mirasedoglu* are hereby CONSOLIDATED in this Court for all  
16 purposes, including trial. All future documents filed in these consolidated actions  
17 SHALL be filed only in this matter.
- 18 (3) Plaintiff SHALL, **within thirty (30) days** of this Order, file an Amended  
19 Consolidated Complaint that includes all allegations and claims from both cases  
20 that she wishes to bring.
- 21 (4) **Within fourteen (14) days** of Plaintiff filing the Amended Consolidated  
22 Complaint, the Parties SHALL meet and confer and file a joint statement indicating  
23 their position(s) on when the Court should issue an initial case scheduling order.
- 24 (5) The Clerk is DIRECTED to file a copy of this Order in the *Mirasedoglu* action.

1 (6) The Clerk is DIRECTED to administratively close the *Mirasedoglu* action.

2 Dated this 12th day of February 2025.

3   
4 \_\_\_\_\_

5 Tana Lin  
6 United States District Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24